

FORMALITIES

Applicants wish to bring to the Examiner's attention that an Information Disclosure Statement ("IDS") filed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.97(d) and (e) was filed on September 14, 2005, receipt of which has been acknowledged by the Patent Office. Accordingly, the Applicants request that the Examiner consider the reference contained in the IDS and provide the Applicants with an initialed copy of the Form PTO SB/08 to acknowledge such consideration.

REMARKS

Claim 1 and claims 9-11 are pending in the subject application. Claim 1 and claims 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and, further, under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended and claims 10 and 11 have been canceled without prejudice. Accordingly, after entry of this amendment, the pending claims will be claim 1 and 9.

The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough examination of the subject application. The Applicants, however, respectfully request reconsideration of the subject application based on the above amendments and the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) REJECTION

The Examiner has again rejected claims 1 and 9-11 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,486,971 to Kawamoto ("Kawamoto" or the "Kawamoto Reference"). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections in view of the above amendments and for reasons detailed below.

According to the Examiner, Kawamoto discloses an apparatus in which "image data of one line of the main scanning direction is stored in the FIFO and this stored data is read from the memory device for enlargement process (col. 8, line 59 – col. 9,

line 6). Thus a write signal (storing signal) is started earlier than a read signal with respect to one particular line during the enlargement." Moreover, per the Examiner, Kawamoto discloses an apparatus in which "image data is read to be processed for the reduction and the processed (reduced) image data is stored in the FIFO (col. 9, lines 7-12). Thus, the read signal is started earlier than the write signal with respect to one particular line during the reduction." The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of col. 9, lines 7-12.

Claim 1 recites that the "write signal for the first-in, first-out memory is started earlier than a read signal therefor when the variable magnification processing is an enlargement, and the read signal for the first-in, first-out memory is started earlier than the write signal therefor when the variable magnification processing is a reduction". However, the passage cited by the Examiner provides that,

[t]he image data written thus processed is [sic: are] then stored in the FIFO memory 63 under the control of the read/write speed control device 62. The image data written in the FIFO memory is [sic: are] read at a predetermined speed."

Kawamoto, col. 9, lines 9-13 (emphasis added). Thus, it is clear that the image data are first stored, i.e., written, in FIFO and then read from FIFO. Thus, Kawamoto teaches away from claim 1. Indeed, Kawamoto teaches that data are written to FIFO then read for an enlargement or for a reduction. Claim 1 of the present invention distinguishes between this and, therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Kawamoto.

Furthermore, Kawamoto teaches two FIFO memory devices whereas the invention as claimed recites a "single" FIFO memory. Accordingly, Kawamoto cannot anticipate the invention as claimed.

Claims 1 and 9 now recite that, "an enlarging variable magnification processing in a sub-scan direction is carried out independently of an enlarging variable magnification processing in a scan direction or a reducing variable magnification

processing in a scan direction is carried out independently of a reducing variable magnification processing in a sub-scan direction".

In a first assertion, the Examiner maintains that, Kawamoto teaches "the enlarging variable magnification processing in a sub-scan direction is carried out independently of the reducing variable magnification in a [main] scan direction." Applicants have amended the claims so that this argument is now believed to be moot.

In a second assertion, according to the Examiner, "the magnification ratio of the sub-scanning direction is changed by the synchronizing signal for the main scanning direction (col. 7, lines 12-19). However, . . . this synchronizing signal [for the main scanning direction] is not related to the magnification processing of the [sub-scanning] scan-direction. Thus, they are independent." The Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion.

Because the image is written on the surface of the photoconductor drum 12 by way of the laser array unit 14, the interval between-main scanning lines is determined by controlling the interval of generating the synchronizing signal for the main scanning direction. That is, the magnification ratio for the sub scanning direction is changed by controlling the interval of generating the synchronizing signal for the main scanning direction. When the interval of generating the synchronizing signal for the main scanning direction is increased, the image is enlarged, and when the interval of generating the synchronizing signal is reduced, the image is reduced.

Kawamoto, col. 7, lines 8-19 (emphasis added). Moreover,

The magnification ratio for the main scanning direction is changed by the second enlarging/reducing process device 53b and the magnification ratio for the sub scanning direction is changed by controlling the interval of generating the synchronizing signal for the main scanning direction.

Id., col. 8, lines 43-48 (emphasis added).

Thus, according to Kawamoto, the image is enlarged (or reduced) "when the interval of generating the synchronizing signal for the main scanning direction" is increased (or decreased) and the magnification ratio (i.e., enlargement or reduction) for the sub scanning direction is controlled by "controlling the interval of generating the synchronizing signal." As a result, according to the teachings of Kawamoto, variable magnification processing in the main scanning direction and variable magnification processing in the sub-scanning direction each depend on the "interval of generating the synchronizing signal". Hence, as the term "independent" is understood, they are not independently carried out.

More specifically, the interval of generating the synchronizing signal determines both the variable magnification processing in the main scanning direction and the variable magnification processing in the sub-scanning direction. The assertion that the "synchronizing signal is not related to the magnification processing of the scan-direction", even if true, is irrelevant.

With respect to claim 9, the claim has also been amended to recite that

"a variable-magnification processing means for increasing and decreasing a number of the image forming means from which one line worth of image data is outputted by increasing and decreasing a number of the turning-on switching means by on/off-controlling the switching means in correspondence to magnification ratio."

Accordingly, the Applicants believe that the Examiner's response to the Applicants' assertion that, the magnification ratio can be controlled by the mere on/off operation of the gates and complicated timing control for the variable magnification of image data is not necessary, is no longer valid.


The Applicants, therefore, believe that claims 1 and 9 are not anticipated or made obvious by the Kawamoto reference and, further, satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 100, et seq., especially § 102(e). As such, the Applicants believe that claims 1 and 9 are allowable. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in a condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

The Applicants believe that no additional fee is required for consideration of the within Response. However, if for any reason the fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge Deposit Account No. **04-1105**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 19, 2005

By: _____


George W. Hartnell, III
Reg. No. 42,639
Attorney for Applicant(s)

EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, Massachusetts 02205
(617) 517-5523
503727